

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZACKARY ELLIS SANDERS,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cr-00143
The Honorable Judge Ellis
Hearing: July 31, 2020

CONSENT MOTION TO SEAL AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF SAME

Pursuant to Local Criminal Rule 49(E), defendant, Zackary Ellis Sanders, through counsel, moves for an order permitting the defense to file under seal portions of Mr. Sanders's Reply to the Government's Opposition to Mr. Sanders's Motion to Compel Discovery, as well as to seal the entirety of exhibit 1 (discovery from the Government), exhibit 2 (Second Declaration from Dr. Matthew Miller), exhibit 3 (discovery from the Government), and exhibit 4 (Declaration from Matthew Ryder, QC) that Mr. Sanders intends to file with this Court on July 30, 2020. A proposed order is attached for the consideration of the Court.¹ The Government has previously consented to Mr. Sanders filing under seal material that relates to discovery that is under a protective order. Mr. Sanders seeks sealing for the same reasons here. In support of this motion, the defense further states:

¹ The document to be filed under seal will be filed with the Court non-electronically pursuant to Local Criminal Rule 49(E) and the Electronic Case Filing Policies and Procedures (*see* p. 21). Pursuant to the Local Rules, the sealed document is to be treated as sealed pending the outcome of this motion.

I. Item to be Filed Under Seal, and Necessity for Sealing

A. Mr. Sanders asks the Court to seal portions of his Reply and the entirety of the exhibits, which pertain to and refer to material that is under a protective order. *See* 1:20-MJ-114 ECT No. 28. The defense has endeavored to seal only the minimum necessary portion of its Motion to Compel Discovery, and will file a redacted version on the public docket.

B. Filing the Reply partially under seal is necessary because the motion contains discussion of material that is under a protective order, exhibits 2 and 4 entirely discuss material under a protective order, and exhibits 1 and 3 are discovery from the government that is, in its entirety, material under a protective order. *See* 1:20-MJ-114 ECT No. 28.

C. Counsel for Mr. Sanders has considered procedures other than filing under seal and none will suffice to protect disclosure of this information subject to a protective order.

II. Previous Court Decisions Which Concern Sealing Documents

The Court has the inherent power to seal materials submitted to it. *See United States v. Wuagneux*, 683 F.2d 1343, 1351 (11th Cir. 1982); *State of Arizona v. Maypenny*, 672 F.2d 761, 765 (9th Cir. 1982); *Times Mirror Company v. United States*, 873 F.2d 1210 (9th Cir. 1989); *see also Shea v. Gabriel*, 520 F.2d 879 (1st Cir. 1975); *United States v. Hubbard*, 650 F.2d 293 (D.C. Cir. 1980); *In re Braughton*, 520 F.2d 765, 766 (9th Cir. 1975). “The trial court has supervisory power over its own records and may, in its discretion, seal documents if the public’s right of access is outweighed by competing interests.” *In re Knight Pub. Co.*, 743 F.2d 231, 235 (4th Cir. 1984).

III. Period of Time to Have the Document Under Seal

The materials to be filed under seal would need to remain sealed as long as the protective order remains in effect.

Accordingly, Mr. Sanders respectfully requests that this Court enter an order allowing the defense to file under seal portions of his Reply, as well as to seal the entirety of exhibit 1 (discovery from the Government), exhibit 2 (Second Declaration from Dr. Matthew Miller), exhibit 3 (discovery from the Government), and exhibit 4 (Declaration from Matthew Ryder, QC).

Dated: July 30, 2020

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Jonathan S. Jeffress
Jonathan S. Jeffress (#42884)
Emily Anne Voshell (#92997)
Jade Chong-Smith (admitted *pro hac vice*)
KaiserDillon PLLC
1099 14th Street, NW
8th Fl. West
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 640-4430
Fax: (202) 280-1034
jjeffress@kaiserdillon.com
evoshell@kaiserdillon.com
jchong-smith@kaiserdillon.com

*Attorneys for Defendant
Zackary Ellis Sanders*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 30, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will then send a notification of such filing to counsel of record.

/s/ Emily Voshell
Emily Voshell

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZACKARY ELLIS SANDERS,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cr-00143
The Honorable Judge Ellis
Hearing: July 31, 2020

[PROPOSED] SEALING ORDER

This matter having come before the Court on the defendant's Consent Motion for Leave to File Under Seal pursuant to Local Criminal Rule 49(E). Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Motion for Leave to File Under Seal is granted.

It is so ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Date: _____

Alexandria, Virginia